IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION No.541 of 2007
WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION No. 370 of 2007

Santosh P. Sonawadekar ..Applicant.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra. ..Respondent.

Mr A. G. Usmani, with Mr Vishal Kolelkar,
Advocates for the Applicant.

Mr U. V. Nikam, APP for the Respondent-State

CORAM: V. C. DAGA,J.
DATED: 15th Oct, 2007.

P.C.:-

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the applicant and learned APP for the respondent-State of Maharashtra.

2. Perused revision petition with documents annexed thereto.

3. After having perused the order challenged, I do not see any perversity in the said order. The learned counsel for the applicant could not point out any perversity or that any particular piece of evidence has not been appreciated by the Courts below. The Courts below have appreciated the evidence in its proper perspective. Thus, the view taken by the Courts below (excluding punishment)is reasonable and possible view.

4. This Court not being a Court of appeal cannot substitute its own view in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. Revisional jurisdiction is not only limited in scope but also is discretionary. The Court interferes in the revisional jurisdiction only in exceptional cases of flagrant miscarriage of justice as held by the Apex Court in the case of **State of Rajasthan v. Gurucharandas Chaddha, AIR 1979 SC 1895.**

5. In the above view of the matter, no case is made out to interfere with the impugned order. In the result, the revision application has no merit. Same is accordingly dismissed with no order as to costs.

6. Criminal Application No. 370 of 2007 also stands disposed of.

(V.C. DAGA,J.)